REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **25 May 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-32. Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mooney et al. (USPN 7,127,209 hereinafter "Mooney").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Mooney. During preparation of the following responses, Applicant has fully considered the reference in its entirety, and given it the broadest interpretation.

Applicant respectfully points out that Mooney describes **generating and communicating a service record which identifies** modem-based services that a communication device can **offer to other** communication devise specifically in search of a modem or modem-based service (see Mooney, abstract and col. 6, lines 35-51). Next, the service record is transmitted to the communication device requesting service. More specifically, the service record includes **a list of available modem-based services** the communication device can choose from (see Mooney, summary of the invention).

In contrast, the instant application teaches **enabling a client device to use a new service** by obtaining and **installing a service profile** associated with a new service **on the client device**. For example, a device profile for a printer can **specify a protocol that allows a client to use the printer**. In order to use the printer, **the client installs an implementation of the device profile** (see page 2, lines 9-13 and page 9, lines 25-27 of the instant application). Note that in the instant application, **installing** the service profile is **a prerequisite** to allow the client device to use the new service.

Applicant respectfully submits that the service record in Mooney is a list of available modem-based services the communication device can choose from.

This service record and its application in Mooney are clearly different from the service profile specified in the instant application. Specifically, the service record in Mooney is used as a checklist for available services, and **does not involve installation**. In contrast, the service profile in the instant application **is installed on the client** to take effect. Note that this installation process facilitates interoperability of the service on different devices.

There is nothing within Mooney, either explicitly or implicitly, which suggests **installing the service profile** for a service **on the client** to enable the client to use the service.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 to clarify that instant application installs the service profile for a new service to enable a client to use the service. These amendments find support on page 2, lines 9-13 and page 9, lines 25-27 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-30, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 24 July 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com